DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 775 TM 850 018

AUTHOR	Jones, Earl
TITLE	Summary Report of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Project, 1976-1984.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; East Texas State Univ., Commerce.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 84
GRANT	605248
NOTE	40p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Development Associates, 693 Sutter St., Third Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102-1077.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Course Evaluation; Educational Improvement; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; Federal Programs; Formative Evaluation; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; *Spanish; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Bilingual Education Act 1968; *East Texas State University; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; External Evaluation; *Texas

ABSTRACT

The goal of the East Texas State University Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual Education Project was to improve the education of limited, and non-English speaking, students in North Texas area schools. This was accomplished by training undergraduate bilingual teachers, in-service teachers (masters program), administrators, and specialists (post masters and doctoral programs). This eight year project (1976-1984) was evaluated annually both internally and externally. The processes were monitored, student progress charted, and participant perceptions measured annually and compared longitudinally. This final report contains 1983-84 information, an evaluation of the entire project, and a brief presentation of the follow-up survey of almost 400 former program participants. Some took only a course or two as needed, some completed only certificate requirements, and 129 completed degree programs. The East Texas State University Bilingual training project was very successful in institutionalizing the project into its regular system. Students viewed the program as worthwhile, and were, generally, successful in gaining their degrees, certificates, and the abilities necessary to teach bilingually and in English as a second language. The annual student evaluation form and the participant follow-up survey questionnaire are appended. (BS)

ED256775

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS

693 SUTTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-1077
415/776-0120

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT 1976 - 1984

Dr. Earl Jones

External Evaluator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 850 018

September 1984

ARLINGTON – 2924 COLUMBIA PIKE, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204-4399 Cable Address: DAWASH 703/979-0100
KINGSTON – 41-D ABBEY COURT COMPOUND, 4 TRAFALGAR ROAD, KINGSTON, JAMAICA
OAKLAND – LATHAM SQUARE BUILDING, SUITE 724, 508 16TH STREET, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612 415/839-2471
PHILIPPINES – 26 MAGDALENA CIRCLE, MAGALLANES VILLAGE, MAKATI, METRO MANILA, PHILIPPINES 011/63 2 85-12-49
SAN FRANCISCO – 693 SUTTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102 415/775-0646

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The external evaluation of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Project necessarily entailed the collection of a great many data. Many University professors and administrators, teachers and administrators from the participating school districts, and the many participants in the program - all gave unstintingly of their time across the years. Their assistance is sincerely appreciated.

Three directors facilitated the work during the ESEA Title VII efforts; without that help, neither the data nor the descriptions of the processes would have been complete. Their wholehearted collaboration is acknowledged:

Dr. William Harvey

Dr. Amado Robledo

Dr. Alonzo Sosa

In addition, much of the detail work fell on the shoulders of the secretaries and graduate assistants. Their work was of inestimable impact on the studies. One secretary, Olga Perez, persisted over many years; her handling of the many instruments and reports was invaluable.

The Bilingual Education Advisory Committee, an important facet of the management of the program, was generous in giving of its time and information to help facilitate the external evaluations. Special thanks go to the members of that committee.

* * * * *

This report was prepared under contract with East Texas State University through ESEA Title VII funding, Grant 605248, from the US Department of Education. Officials of East Texas State University and the participating districts assisted by providing or facilitating information. The data reported, however, and the conclusions drawn, do not necessarily represent the official positions of the officials nor an endorsement by them, nor of the US Department of Education, nor should an endorsement be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

LIST OF TABLES ii

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY AND BILINGUAL EDUCAITON. 1

Historical Development 1
Institutionalization Review. 3
Professionalization Perspectives 4
Program Processes. 5

THE EVALUATIONS. 7

Internal Evaluation. 7
External Evaluation. 9
Limitations to the Evaluation. 12

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM. 14

PARTICIPANT PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM 18

Perceptions of Services. 18
Perceptions of the Instruction 21

A SEPARATE FOLLOWUP SURVEY 25

Characteristics of the Survey Participants 26
Course Grouping Judgments. 27

REPORT SUMMARY 30

APPENDICES 32

LIST OF TABLES

1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1984. 15

2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1984. 16

3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Populations: 1979-1984. . 16

4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1984 16

5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Means on the Degree Design: 1976-1984 19

6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of the Liaison Services: 1976-1984. . 20

7: Comparative Overall Ratings by STudents of the Courses Taken to Fulfill their Degree Requirements: 1976 through 1984. 23

8: Occupations of the Responding Survey Students 26

9: Mean Ratings of the Survey Respondents on the Program Course Groupings. 27

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The civil rights movement, federal legislation, and court cases on the educational problems of students who speak little or no English enabled the several programs designed to better educate those children. The Texas legislation and subsequent programming, now about a decade ago, gave a substantial impetus to the provision of bilingual education and other special services, such as English as a second language classes. Texas, like most states, was unprepared to introduce these programs. The ESEA Title VII programs were of inestimable assistance to the state and districts, as well as the universities, in the preparation of materials, funding local programs, and training teachers.

Historical Development

East Texas State University was one of the early Texas institutions to begin work toward providing teachers. With a small early grant, a great deal of effort was expended in assisting districts in the preparation of materials and their instructional modes in multicultural education, an essential component in helping children adapt to school and enhance their feelings of self worth. The growing number of limited English speaking children in the North Texas area gave a high priority to teacher preparation there. East Texas State University's history of services to school districts placed it in an advantageous position to begin the training.

1976-1977

Although funded after the beginning of the academic year, the University was able to utilize the fall profitably by completing the course syllabi, certificate programs, and degree program plans that had been begun earlier. Bilingual staff was acquired and/or identified to conduct the courses. An agreement with the Dallas Independent School District was solidified so that services could begin at the beginning of the next quarter. The first students began their programs in spring, both at the Commerce campus and in the satellite service center in the Dallas metropolitan area.

Most of the first students were certified teachers with experience in the classroom but who had had no training in implementing bilingual education. For the most part, they took courses that would allow them the bilingual education endorsement but many also elected to obtain the masters degree over a period of time. A summer program was also utilized for these same purposes, plus making it possible for degree seekers to fulfill part of the residency requirement.

1977-1978

During the second year, the major processes associated with the consolidation of management, enhancing the resources and services available to the participants, and the extension of the work to include a larger number of agencies and institutions. The early cooperation with the Dallas Independent School District was continued and the McKinley Independent School District was added. East Texas State University membership in the Federation Bilingual Training Resource Center increased the resources available to the Title VII program and in return, the University contributed experience based knowledge to the management of the Federation operations. An augmented thrust the second year was the strengthening of the work with the Mexican American community, especially in the principal target area, Dallas, both by including that segment of the population in the management aspects of the program and in providing leadership enhancement training and other services to

its members. Student enrollment at the undergraduate and graduate levels grew rapidly, allowing a full component of courses toward the certificate endorsement and the degree programs.

1978-1979

This year, with the courses, programs, and management firmly in place, the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII program was able to further extend its services to add several new districts: Diocese of Dallas, Irving, Garland, Plano, Ennis, Mesquite, Mt. Pleasant, Paris, Tulia, and New Braunfels. Students were drawn from an ever larger area while the participation from Dallas was increased. From the beginning, relations with the Texas Education Agency, the educational service centers, and other universities in the area were positive. One evidence of this was the cooperative effort between the Agency and the University to offer the first courses on the teaching of English as a second language during the summer term. Counseling assistance with a Native American organization, while not resulting in a bilingual program, improved services to that group.

1979-1980

This fourth year showed further consolidation and expansion of the program. The courses were updated and additional materials were included as they became available. Permission to grant a doctorate was sought and obtained, and the federal funds for a few scholarships for that level were achieved. Specialist programs beyond the masters degree were also inaugurated. The number of undergraduate students was increased and the masters program continued to grow. Beginning efforts to provide assistance to other language groups showed difficulties in meeting the requirements for these minor languages but assistance to multicultural instruction was provided. The University and the Texas Education Agency again cooperated on summer courses in teaching English as a second language. Funds for working with the target communities were not provided this year but some of the activities were continued via volunteer work by the students and the staff. The Federation Bilingual Resource Center was not refunded and the loss of materials from that organization was a significant one, even though the member universities attempted to take over the functions the Federation had given.

1980-1981

During this fifth project year, East Texas State University was able to increase the participating student numbers even though many colleges were experiencing substantial decreases. Further, more and more students were being attracted to the program from other parts of the state, from other areas of the US, and from Mexico. A bilingual science educator was added to the faculty. Management was modified to relieve the enormous burden that was shouldered by the administrators, and the University was able to add a staff person. This year, too, the library holdings were expanded at the Satellite Learning Center, improving student review of relavent research and other literature.

1981-1982

The sixth program year gave more emphasis to the undergraduate instead of the graduate enrollments; the undergraduates increased and there was some decrease in the graduates. An endorsement plan to add English as a second language to the teaching certificate was approved and gegun in operation. Several changes in the upper management of the University were made this year and the new officers were oriented to the bilingual education program. Services to new districts increased as the Texas laws added new dimensions to the services that had to be provided.

1982-1983

Year seven saw the proportions of undergraduates and graduates remain about the same except that fewer doctoral fellowships were available. Administrative exigencies caused a consolidation of the two management posts into one; the long experience of the coordinator made it possible to continue effectively as the director. Two more bilingual professors were appointed to graduate faculty status, facilitating the advice to students and reducing the work load on the director. Funds were not granted for the news organ, *Boletín*, but other communications continued at a satisfactory level.

1983-1984

New University standards caused a slight decrease in new enrollments, particularly with the undergraduates, but the program maintained its overall enrollment. The addition of an English as a Second Language certificate endorsement and degree programs, facilitated by the several years of cooperative course offerings with the Texas Education Agency, was popular since that subject area has increased in the local schools. Cooperation with North Texas school districts was spurred by the new English as a second language programs with advisory services needed to aid the districts in setting them up. Both the bilingual and the English as a second language certificates were extended to secondary schools, thus the project worked extensively with the Department of Secondary Education to implement the courses and curricula.

1984-1985

No ESEA Title VII funds were granted for this academic year. The program, however, continued in operation, a testimony to the institutionalization effected by East Texas State University. The loss of the stipends to eligible students, a severe blow since many other scholarship funds were also in short supply, caused some students to at least temporarily leave the program. The enrollment, though, was not decreased as much as had been anticipated; the greatest losses were in new enrollments.

Institutionalization Review

From the very beginning, East Texas State University consistently planned for maximum institutionalization of the ESEA Title VII project into its regular operation. The first and third directors were already within the tenure track system; the second, new to the University, was employed in that same status. Some federal funds were utilized to pay for the project's work but the University always paid a part of the salary. Most of the professors, too, were regular employees, paid at least partially within the regular budget. Additionally, the University actively recruited qualified faculty members for the positions, not only in the bilingual and the later English as a second language programs, but also to offer the basic courses in the sciences and social sciences. Some portion of their salaries was from federal funds, especially that part relating to monitoring the students and providing the special services to school districts. A few adjunct professors were necessary at heavy load periods; only one long term faculty member remained for an extended time in that status.

It is also important to note that the University made no special, interim arrangements for courses or for degree or certificate programs. Each one followed the regular path through the several committees and their approval was mandatory for inclusion in the training project. Further, the courses and programs were sub-

mitted to the Texas Education Agency and the State Board for approval as inclusion as regular University courses and programs. Evidence to the success of this effort included their approval by the reviews of the Texas Education Agency, the Southern Association, and the Educational Administration accreditation.

A vital component in the formulation of the bilingual education program was the acquisition of an extensive set of regular library references and specialized teaching materials. While the Title VII funds helped in this collection, the library also used much of its own funds. Further, since two principal sites were utilized for the instruction, the home campus at Commerce and the Satellite Learning Center in the Dallas area, the provision of an adequate set of materials in both places furnished all students the opportunity to make use of them. While this substantially raised the proportion supplied by the University, it was seen as necessary to the implementation of the Title VII project and to the general education provided by the University.

In summary, East Texas State University managed an unusually high degree of institutionalization of the ESEA Title VII project into its regular system. The evaluator has studied and consulted with many Title VII university programs and none was able to incorporate the staff into its tenure track system as successfully as did East Texas State University. Further, the total integration of the courses and programs, and the strong commitment evidenced by the library holdings, are also exceptional. The University made wise use of the federal funds and, too, invested substantial sums from its own revenues into the the bilingual education program.

Professionalization Perspectives

The operation of an ESEA Title VII project involves a great deal of routine work, that pressure often used as a rationalization for avoiding committee assignments, for not serving organizations and agencies, and for the lack of professional publications. This was not the case of the project personnel at East Texas State University.

- The staff served on the committees for graduate students, curriculum, certification, graduate school, advisory committees, faculty selection groups, and special committees set up by the University.
- The faculty was active in the National and Texas Associations for Bilingual Education, the Foreign Language Association, with the North Texas University Federation, and many other professional organizations.
- The professors functioned as advisors to the nearby regional service centers, aided in the development of programs for them, and authored and co-authored publications for those agencies; they also worked in several capacities and as publication contributors to the Evaluation and Dissemination Center in Dallas.
- They read papers at many professional meetings and published important contributions on language, social organization, and teaching, notably:

  Children's Literature Anthology (ETSU)

  Mexican Americans in a West Dallas Barrio (University of Arizona Press)

  Bilingual Special Education: A Challenge for the 1980s (TADE)

  Una Buena Maestra/A Good Teacher: A Preliminary Report of Parental Views in a Texas School District (Applied Anthropology)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- *Prevention of Reading Disabilities in Bilingual Students (ETSU)*
- *Cancionero Bilingüe (ETSU)*
- *Reading and Bilingualism (Texas Council of Reading Bulletin)*
- *English and Spanish in the Bilingual Child (Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese)*
- *Annotated Bibliography of Bilingual Legislation and Court Cases (ETSU Library)*
- *Mathematics for the Bilingual Child (Regional Service Center)*
- *The Social Studies in Bilingual Education (Regional Service Center)*

It should also be noted that much of the study material for the university students was developed by the faculty since most textbooks were general rather than specific to the needs of the North Texas area.

Finally, the professionalization of the faculty is evidenced in the many services to the Texas Education Agency deliberations on certificates and programs, to the Regional Service Centers, and directly to school districts. One faculty member served on the advisory committee to the California Legislature study of educational services to limited and non-English speaking students, a longitudinal evaluation that has served as the model for many other studies, including the present national evaluation.

Program Processes

The program at East Texas State University was designed to increase the effectiveness of teachers and administrators in meeting the needs of limited and non-English speaking pupils in the state, and especially in the northern part of the state. The programs at all three levels - undergraduate, masters, and doctorate - first offer a strong preparatory program in the several kinds of subject matter to be taught, in the methods for general education, in the specific methods for bilingual education, and in linguistics and the Spanish language. That is, the University is concerned that the participants know, for example, mathematics and how to teach mathematics in both English and Spanish. Bilingual and multicultural skills in counseling, administration, and other specializations are included. Expertise in working with parents and other community members of different cultures is an important part of the program.

As would be expected, then, East Texas State University incorporated a wide variety of academic resources into the program, utilizing the knowledge and expertise of many disciplines: English, Spanish, linguistics, history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, education, and administration. This necessitated the cooperation of three colleges and several departments within the University, as well as the graduate division. The degree design and the course syllabi were carefully prepared with the advice of the bilingual education personnel of the Texas Education Agency, the Dallas Independent School District, and representatives of the potential students and communities. Further modifications were made as each successive year's experiences were evaluated. New courses, programs, and certificates were added as they became appropriate for the schools and authorized by the State of Texas.

Many courses were offered in the districts from which the students came, helping to increase the reality based nature of the program. Field experiences were also provided for students not currently teaching in bilingual education. Resource

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

persons from the Mexican American community, both general citizens and a number of professionals, were brought into the planning process. East Texas State University staff members with skills and experience in related fields were utilized. This combination, together with the Mexican Americans and other Latin Americans on the staff, furnished expert inputs.

An essential ingredient in the plan was the participation of the bilingual teachers in the presentations in the classes, whether brought in as special resources or included as participants. The knowedge and skills they had gained, the materials they were using, and their general experiences added a substantial dimension of practicality to the training.

Just as important, too, was the use of the Spanish language in the courses by both the professors and the students. While there were some limitations to the oral/aural capabilities with Spanish in both groups, each was expected to strive for a continual increase in the amount of Spanish in the lectures, discussions, and written work in order to provide some of the bilingual environment and furnish opportunities for the acquisition of a professional grasp of the language. The University chose professors with the greatest command of Spanish while at the same time being specialists in their fields.

Liaison services were also incorporated. Faculty with appointments that allowed monitoring of classes in which the students worked made this possible. These monitors assisted the students with any problems encountered in implementing bilingual or regular education, and as well helped the principals of the schools in many ways. Also, these liaison services helped keep the faculty abreast of bilingual education in the schools.

Since Latin Americans and Spanish were relatively new to the North Texas area, the University recognized the need to increase the professional contacts between these groups and the faculty and students. Community involvement was vital in this regard, augmenting the direct experiences with the families of the children being served. The University also brought in well known Mexican Americans in labor, business, the media, politics, education, and research, so the faculty and students could attend seminars and discussion sessions with them. These appearances were well received, not only by those involved in bilingual education, but as well by other faculty and students, and the community at large. The press was especially interested and many useful articles were published in the area; television and radio furnished exposure to an even wider audience.

The faculty and students assisted appropriate student and community organizations to conduct their own programs and to become acquainted with bilingual education. While these concentrated on Mexican and other Latin American organizations, the multicultural aspects were enhanced through the participation of faculty and students in organizations of other groups such as Native Americans, Blacks, and Asians. Some important help to districts was enabled via these contacts.

In summary, the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education project was a fully integrated set of processes. Intense interaction among the University community, the areas and districts served by the program, the several organizations important to the cultures and languages, and the official agencies of the State and Federal governments was an intentional ingredient. Too, the courses and programs were fully incorporated into the regular University structure. Similarly, the instruction emphasized the subjects and methods vital to good teaching in any setting, then bilingual education was added to it. The result was high acceptance by the communities and professionals.

THE EVALUATIONS

Three separate approaches were utilized in the evaluation of the East Texas State University Title VII Bilingual Education Program: internal, external formative, and external summative. The first, internal, had two sources - the regular University evaluation activities and the monitoring of all work by the administration of the Title VII project. The second, formative by an external evaluator, was accomplished through an exit interview and an interim written report at the conclusion of each external monitoring. The third, summative by an external evaluator, was primarily composed of the presentation of the data and conclusions through the annual report.

Internal Evaluation

East Texas State University maintained strict accounting of student enrollment, fiscal management, and faculty preparation for teaching the courses. The University was thus the most efficient source of information on these areas and it furnished reports on them to the funding source through its regular channels.

The supervisory functions of the deans of the colleges and of the heads of departments, added further dimensions to the management of the project. University wide committees on curricula, courses, and degrees contributed to the development of quality in the program. Faculty committees for the students seeking the undergraduate and graduate degrees, unique to each student or handled by an advisor, maintained an individual completion and quality control, as well as contributing to the students' development in the profession. The Academic Vice President was directly charged with the supervision of all teaching/learning programs, thus involving the central administration in the evaluation function.

Special advisory committees to the bilingual teacher training project also were constituted, including members from appropriate university entities, the Dallas Independent School District, students, and the community. These committees' functions in planning, assessment, and revision of the program helped assure that the objectives were reached.

The project staff also used a wide variety of consultants to aid in the several phases of the program. Representatives from the regional education service centers, the Texas Education Agency, community organizations, faculty from other universities, and the US Department of Education, added further depth to the evaluation. The continuous input, through the liaison personnel, from the aides, teachers, and administrators of the several schools and districts from which they came, also gave an internal formative evaluation dimension difficult to achieve in most university programs. The liaisons completed a standard form after each monitoring or assistance visits to the schools, with the district administration, and when participating in community activities. (See the form in Appendix B.) The information from these was integrated into the internal project reports at mid

SCHEMATUM OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION DESIGN

Sources:	Monitoring:
Internal	
University Departments, Colleges, Central Administration	Supervision of faculty and students, schedules, programs, and syllabi
Coordinator, Bilingual Education	Academic advising and review of student progress
Director, Title VII ESEA Project	General management and fiscal control of project resources
External Evaluator	Feedback from monitoring
External	
US Department of Education	Supervision of programmatic and fiscal elements
Dallas Independent School District and other participating districts	Recommendations on participants and programmatic aspects; feedback on student progress as they teach
Texas Education Agency	General supervision of the certification program and course offerings
External Evaluator	Monitoring of all activities through observations, interviews, and document reviews; evidenced in interim and final reports and conferences.

year and at the conclusion of the year, thus they were not included in this external report. Further, the information from the other internal evaluation activities were embodied in the project's reports and likewise were excluded from the present study.

External Evaluation

In 1976, East Texas State University contracted with a private firm, Development Associates with headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, and a branch office in San Antonio, Texas, to perform the external evaluation. The company has conducted many local, regional, and national surveys, needs assessments, and evaluation studies in the field of bilingual education. The agreement called for both formative and summative evaluation for the year 1976-1977.

Dr. Earl Jones, senior associate and bilingual education specialist, was assigned the major research tasks connected with the contract. His experience in bilingual education in Texas and Paraguay, and later in California and Guatemala, his proficiency in English and Spanish, his teaching, research, and administrative roles in schools and universities, together with his service in evaluating a large number of Title VII and other bilingual programs, gave him the wide perspective necessary for this project evaluation. (A curriculum vitae was appended to the 1976-1977 report.)

The contract was renewed during the second year, 1977-1978. When Development Associates closed its Texas office, an agreement was reached whereby Dr. Jones would continue the external evaluation with the East Texas State University program as an independent affiliate with Development Associates. Subsequently, Dr. Jones was transferred to the San Francisco, California, office of the company as director of the Study of California Services to Limited and non-English Speaking Students, funded by the California Legislature. The independent affiliate relationship was maintained for the East Texas State University contract and the later formative and summative activities were conducted under that arrangement.

The funding for the formative and summative evaluation has always been severely limited. To maximize the utility of the activities therefore, the agreement called for the following tasks, each to serve both functions:

- Monitor the graduate classes offered.
- Survey sample bilingual education classes taught by the participating students.
- Seek information on the conduct of the program from both district and University officials.
- Study the documents related to the project or emanating from it.
- Confer with the project personnel and teaching faculty on the implementation of the project.

Recommendations were to be made to the project staff after each task, providing formative information for the improvement of the program. Two monitoring schedules were provided and conducted, and both oral

and written interim reports were submitted to the director. Summaries of the findings were incorporated, when pertinent, within this annual report.

As a result of the first evaluation tasks in 1977, including a study of the project documents and conferences with personnel, a more precise investigation into the students' perceptions of the program was recommended. The agreement was modified to include this facet. The instruments were then derived cooperatively by the evaluator, the project director, and the faculty advisory committee. The questionnaires were administered, the data analyzed, and the results reported in each of the annual and interim reports since then. At the beginning of the present project year, a review of the results for the past several years showed a few questions producing little of utility to the project. The instrument was appropriately modified and the present version is contained in Appendix A.

Monitoring

Funding permitted two sets of monitoring, one conducted in late fall and the other in summer. Regular class conduct was monitored during alternate observations of lecture, discussion, and other activities on the home campus and at the Satellite Center in Dallas. Even alternate sessions did not cover all the activities, and at times, classes, and the information was supplemented through open ended interviews with a sample of the students. Interviews with the professors and reviews of their syllabi furnished additional data on the courses and changes that were effected in them.

Additionally, a number of other activities of the project were monitored during the two periods: a special seminar by an outside consultant, meetings with the certification and advisory committees, a general student meeting, and special conferences with the University President, the Dean of Education, and the Head of the Department of Elementary Education.

Project Documentation

The project proposal and its subsequent negotiated modifications, the interim reports by the project personnel, and the continuation documents submitted to the US Department of Education, were provided for examination. Resource materials, research and class papers by students, correspondence with several agencies, and the project arrangements with the Federation of North Texas Universities were reviewed. Evidence of faculty and student participation in professional activities was also furnished.

The Student Perceptions Study

The student study was set up to provide interim data, via student opinions, on the conduct of courses, progress in Spanish, content or methods offered and needed, suggestions for improving the program generally, and ratings of their degree design. Additionally, the instruments were prepared so they could be coded and analyzed through computer services to reduce the costs to the evaluation and to furnish longitudinal analyses across the years.

The data analyses were performed at the Computer Center of Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, the first two years, utilizing punch cards that could be input in subsequent years. These were later transferred to tape as the cumulated data became too bulky for punch card input. The process was continued via a

compatible program at San Francisco (California) State University since that time. (The coding and analysis setup were detailed in the 1976-1977 report and are not repeated herein.) Versions 6, 8, and 9 of the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (Nie et al) were used. No names were used on the instruments but the students were asked to provide their social security numbers; when these were included, longitudinal tracking of changes in their perceptions was performed. Overall longitudinal studies, including all students, were also done.

The instrumentation comprised three separate forms. The first primarily sought certain biographical/demographic data to be used as possible differentiating variables for analyzing the long term results. Students were also asked to rate their proficiency in oral/aural and reading Spanish when they began the program. That rating on Form A, supplied the basis for subsequent analyses of progress in that language. Form B requested suggestions for improving the program and the individual courses, and obtained an update on their Spanish proficiency. The opinionnaire, Form C, in keeping with the general University policy of student evaluation of courses, gave the opportunity for rating the several design and conduct aspects of the courses, an overall rating on each, and estimates of the amount of Spanish used by the students and the professors in the courses. (All three forms are included in Appendix A.)

During the first year, the questionnaires were handed out during one of the last class periods with an explanation of the purpose. The students were urged to participate. The professor then left the room and those students who wished to complete an instrument, voluntarily, did so, handed them to a student who sealed them into a stamped envelope and mailed the package directly to the evaluator. Assurance was given that neither the project staff nor the professor would see the completed instruments. Students were allowed to submit evaluations without including their social security numbers if they wished. Slightly more than 10% of them has left this blank. across the years.

The voluntary participation was disappointing in some classes, totalling about 20% in one case and rising to about 80% in others. The student monitor had been provided a list of the students and was asked to note those that had completed a questionnaire. Because of the relatively low rate of return, it was subsequently decided that the list might have been a deterrent to responding; it was thereafter dropped. The response rate for the following quarter then rose dramatically. Again, however, the rate decreased to its lowest level in the next quarter. Consequently, students were also given the opportunity to mail the questionnaire themselves. Professors were also reminded to distribute the forms since interviews showed that some had neglected to do so. An increase was then experienced but the return rates have varied considerably across the years since then.

Substantial increases in the instrument return rates have been experienced in the last three years: 135 in 1980-1981, 147 in 1981-1982, and 156 in 1983 and 1984. A part of the increase is due to more undergraduates taking more courses but graduate students are also completing more evaluations.

As will be seen in the tables reporting the results of the analyses, the N sizes were small for some courses and some sessions. In some courses, the number of students was quite small, especially those related to research and the individual projects, appropriate to the nature of that type of work. Absenteeism no doubt also accounted for some of the losses. The voluntary aspect also reduced the number sent in. Because of these circumstances, there was no necessary relationship between the number of respondents listed in the tables of this report and the enrollment in the courses. The small numbers weakened this portion of the study but could not have been avoided without prejudicing the rights of privacy of the students.

To ascertain whether the low response rate for some courses biased the calculated replies, an examination of them was conducted. The study showed that excluding those with only one or two forms, no necessary relationship existed between the number of respondents and the ratings; that is, students submitted instruments with low, medium, and high ratings in all but four courses. In those, no *weak* or *very weak* ratings were checked and only four *fair* replies were registered for all of the different course components. In two of the four only *strong* and *very strong* ratings were given. In other courses, however, and often involving the same students, some very low ratings were assigned. Interviews with some students were also conducted to examine the possibilities of biases and no direct relationships appeared. Some students who did not submit evaluations stated they simply did not do so; their stated ratings would have included the complete range of ratings offered. It is believed, therefore, that no substantial bias entered the ratings when three or more students completed the forms.

The instruments, as received via the mail by the evaluator, were then coded and keypunched for statistical analysis. The codings were 100% verified, the analyses performed, and the appropriate tables for the report were prepared. The computer cards for all the years to date were subsequently committed to magnetic tape for use in future longitudinal analyses.

Two kinds of data were transmitted to the project. The general information included in the tables in this report, plus the discussions with the director, was the first and most important to the formative evaluation. Professors were given the opportunity to request private data on their individual courses but only two did so. This annual report, including some analyses across the six years, was also to be tendered to the project director for the use of the University, the Bilingual Education Program, and the US Department of Education. The specific course designations are not disclosed within this report to protect the instructors.

Limitations to the Evaluation

Despite the several sources of information and the broad coverage of the design, one obvious weakness remained without investigation: the impact of the program on improving the teaching abilities of the students such that their pupils learned more. Stated more succinctly,

as a question, did the children in the classrooms of the students learn more because their teachers were participating in this project and degree program? The difficulties of such measurement are myriad and even controversial. The subject should not be avoided, however, simply because measurement is difficult and because the project lacked the funds and other resources to carry out such a study. Serious thought to providing at least some tentative conclusions should be given and some resources should be provided by the US Department of Education or other entities to conduct this important research.

Finally, the funding provided for external evaluation was small and the investigations, therefore, were necessarily brief, even in some cases cursory. The report must be taken within that limitation Despite this handicap, a great deal of useful information was furnished throughout the study and that information helped the University and the project improve the program and its services. The external evaluator knows of no events or processes that were not scrutinized and therefore submits this report with confidence in the findings unless otherwise stated.

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM

East Texas State University conducted a needs assessment on the training required in the North Texas area at the beginning of its program. Utilizing the data available from the Texas Education Agency, published research, and surveys in the immediate geographic region, it was evident that the deficiencies in all levels of resources to conduct bilingual education were critical. The Mexican American population was growing very rapidly in the Dallas and Fort Worth areas; moderate increases were noted in the smaller population centers throughout the North Texas portion of the state.

The first thrust, and still the largest in terms of numbers, was the provision of bilingual education methods and techniques to already certified teachers in elementary schools. Two options were available: the courses needed for the endorsement to the elementary certificate and a full masters degree program in bilingual education. As soon as this program was stabilized, the University then planned and negotiated approved programs for undergraduates so they could enter the bilingual education field directly; a specialist program beyond the masters degree was needed that would equip experienced personnel to aid the administration and teachers in the implementation of bilingual education; and the doctorate in education, which would provide both specializations and at the same time furnish high level personnel for other functional positions in universities, agencies, and local administrations.

All four levels were direly needed throughout the North Texas area and the nation. Increases in the number of pupils that could benefit from bilingual education and programs to serve them, have kept the demand high. The four programs are still needed if the students in elementary and secondary schools are to be educated within an environment that will facilitate their abilities to enter, profit from, and contribute to the educational, social, political, and economic life of the state and the nation.

Program Participants

The majority of the East Texas State University Title VII participants came from the Dallas Independent School District, which cooperated directly with the program. Many others, however, came from other districts in the North Texas area, and recently, from all over Texas.

In the early years, almost all the participants were teachers in the first four grades of school since that was the emphasis for bilingual certification. Since that time, the numbers of participants from the other grades and from other positions in the schools have increased markedly, demonstrating an attraction to the East Texas State University program. That change is significant since several universities in the area offer some levels of training for bilingual education.

The University guarantees the privacy of information, therefore, the reporting on the several characteristics studied is voluntary. Too, many students participating in the courses were not assisted financially by Title VII. The two factors combine so that the percentages cited in the accompanying tables do not necessarily translate into the numbers officially registered as ESEA Title VII participants.

The wide variety of occupations of the reporting participants is displayed in Table 1. The changes across the years represent differing emphases in the schools on the provision of bilingual education and ESL in different grades, and the group receiving special assistance from the project.

Table 1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1984

Occupation	1976 %	1977 %	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1984 %
Teacher: kindergarten	10	12	12	14	12	4	3	1	3
grades 1-3	36	47	48	43	30	27	22	27	35
grades 4-6	13	13	14	4	15	12	9	12	10
grades 7-8	4	2	4	8	3	8	6	*	0
grades 9-12	3	1	4	7	7	6	5	14	10
adult	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Aide	**	**	**	**	6	8	5	0	9
Volunteer	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Administrator	2	2	3	6	6	2	3	3	6
Computer/media	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Curriculum writer	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	0
Resource teacher	1	1	2	2	4	0	1	1	8
Student/unemployed	**	**	**	**	6	18	42	38	17
Unspecified other	15	13	11	24	1	4	1	0	2
No response	1	9	0	0	0	3	2	0	0

** Grades 7 through 12 were combined into a single "secondary" response.*
***Between the 1979 and 1980 reports, the computer program was expanded to account for these specifications formerly grouped under "other."*

The principal drawing area was the Dallas area; as the teachers there gained the credential and/or degree, decreases were expected. However, these were partially offset by the inclusion of other area districts and by losses from the already prepared teachers. The large increase in students that were unemployed mostly resulted from the changed emphasis to funding that group.

The total and bilingual teaching experience of the students in the first few years was fairly stable. As many of the experienced instructors completed their certifications and degrees, the total experience diminished. The bilingual experience continued to rise until 1982, when the higher proportion of undergraduates diluted that factor. Similarly, the 1983 offerings for ESL teachers, many of whom do not teach in bilingual education, decreased the experience variable for bilingual but not the total years. Table 2 compares the frequencies for both total and bilingual experience for the last five years; 1979 was representative of the previous project years and thus the entire project period would have added little to the information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1984

Experience Categories	Total						Bilingual					
	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	4	4	12	39	33	20	8	6	22	44	48	20
Less than one year	8	6	16	14	14	5	29	21	29	19	17	20
One to two years	18	11	16	11	15	18	22	11	16	14	16	20
Three to five years	29	39	14	11	12	25	25	38	14	5	9	25
Six to ten years	18	20	14	8	19	26	10	12	4	7	11	15
Eleven years or more	23	20	16	8	11	8	6	12	2	2	3	0
No response	0	0	10	3	6	0	0	0	0	9	5	0

The relatively large increase in the "none" category in 1983 when compared to 1982 represents mostly those teachers returning to the University to gain the ESL training, many of whom had not been involved in bilingual education. The number of undergraduate students, also a part of the "none" category, remained about the same although their percentage of the total reporting was slightly smaller than the previous year.

The proportion of male to female students was stable the last four years with only minor variations. (Table 3) The proportion of males continued higher than in the early years of the project.

Table 3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Populations: 1979-1984

Sex	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male	12	19	16	18	18	15
Female	88	81	84	82	82	85

Ethnicity changed a great deal in 1981 and some of that difference remained in 1982 and 1983. In all the earlier years, Mexican Americans had made up more than half. In the latter years, the number decreased, as did the percentage, while the number of Anglos and other Latin Americans increased. It should be noted, however, that some Mexican Americans that speak little or no Spanish classified themselves in the "Anglo and other" category. (Table 4)

Table 4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1984

Ethnicity	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Mexican American	53	55	37	43	41	50
Other Latin Americans	0	7	8	10	11	8
Black	2	0	2	1	1	2
American Indian	0	0	2	2	1	0
Anglo and other	45	38	52	44	46	40

The changes in the composition of the participants across the years by and large follows the proportionate need and with subsequent reductions when the greatest need was met. Subsequent changes in the laws, such as the addition of new endorsements and certificates, were again reflected in the enrollments. Note particularly:

- The kindergarten scarcity was met during the first five years.
- The grades 1-3 enrollment was high at the beginning, since those were the target grades, declined somewhat, and then rose again when the ESL endorsement became available.
- Secondary remained quite low until the bilingual and ESL certificates were extended to that level.

The unspecified and no response categories declined after a period of time, apparently due to increased confidence that the data would not be associated with the names and other identifiable information.

The experience levels remained almost exactly the same during the first four of the program years, thus the first three are omitted from the table. After that, some changes occurred in the total experience:

- The no experience group increased rapidly when the emphasis on project funding was shifted to the undergraduates.
- The more experienced levels decreased as these teachers acquired their endorsements and degrees; there was another increase when the ESL endorsement became available.

Bilingual experience, on the other hand, followed a fairly steady decline since these teachers hurried to obtain their endorsements early. Some increase was evidenced during the last two years as the bilingual teachers decided to work toward the ESL endorsement.

The sex ratios did not change appreciably across the years. Men generally made up about fifteen percent.

Mexican Americans made up the majority of the students at the beginning but the proportion declined after the early bilingual teachers earned their bilingual endorsements. It rose again, however, when the ESL endorsement became available. Blacks and Native Americans rarely enrolled, primarily because of the requirement to speak or learn Spanish. It was anticipated that the ESL programs would augment their numbers but that did not occur.

East Texas State University, in its ESEA Title VII project, was able to attract the kind and quality of students stated in its objectives. The initial urgency to train those teachers already teaching in bilingual classrooms, but without the desired training and certificates, was met. Subsequently, degrees, reflecting the full spate of bilingual courses, were the attracting element. The quality of the programs kept the students enrolled beyond the exigencies of certification, a major success of the University.

PARTICIPANT PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

There is a great deal of university competition in the North Texas area. Unlike some programs for bilingual education that experience little or no growth, East Texas State University undertook careful monitoring of the services rendered and the programs and courses offered in order to maximize its enrollments and, thusly, better serve the needs of bilingual children in its catchment area. One indication of its success was noted earlier - in the period following 1981, many North Texas universities experienced a decrease in student enrollment but the bilingual education program at East Texas State University maintained its numbers.

A part of this monitoring system at the East Texas State University Title VII project was specific to the participants in that program; the University also conducted evaluations across all colleges, adding emphasis to its concerns. The general University and the Title VII evaluations protected the confidentiality of the documents submitted by the students and the information on courses, thereby professors, was equally protected.

Too, the student evaluations were voluntary, although every effort was made to assure them of the anonymity of their responses; the replies varied somewhat over the years, starting at about 70% and thereafter rising to nearly 90% for most of the program years.

The degree programs, as set out in the introductory section, included the full range of subject matter courses, persuant to the University's objectives of fully preparing good teachers, not just in bilingual methodologies. Those inclusions, however, meant that because of the selection of many majors and minors by the students, at times only a very few were enrolled in a course. These small numbers made it statistically impossible to examine every course across the years for this final report although the interim reports, submitted confidentially to the director, contained that information so that adjustments could be made, when possible, to improve the program offerings. The present document, therefore, examines the course perceptions via generalized subject matter, useful in itself in making certain judgments about the students' participation and acquisition of skills and of knowledge.

The services persisted across the eight years of Title VII funding, and for the most part, continue beyond it. Some variation in funding in different years varied the amount that could be rendered. Professional speakers, for example, now charge substantially more than in the early years; that, plus some reduction in that line item, made it impossible to supply the number utilized earlier. As will be seen, however, the student perceptions of the services appeared to have concentrated on quality rather than quantity.

Perceptions of Services

Degree design was seen as a service since it implied a set of advisory, counseling, and assistance services to the student. The design is developed over a period of time, thus the annual evaluations would be expected to be modified as the student perceives its growth and implementation. The anxieties about the design are evident as the students first enroll, rating it somewhat lower, and then increasing the positiveness as they proceed through the processes.

Table 5 displays the design perceptions across the eight years. Note the lower mean at the beginning, about midway between fair and strong, and then the gradual

increase through 1980, a small dip as many new students entered in 1981, and again a rise thereafter.

The ratings for the last two years, well above the strong level, and higher than in any previous period. Some of the professors were new at the beginning of the project, some of the processes were not yet finalized because of negotiations with the accrediting authorities, and the general new student worries over a degree design, contributed to the considerably lower perceptions during the first few years. Regularized procedures and high quality advisement no doubt accounted for the very positive ratings the last two years.

Table 5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Means on the Degree Design: 1976-1984

Rating Category*	1976 %	1977 %	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1984 %
Very strong	8	9	10	6	18	14	16	25	26
Strong	32	37	47	53	51	41	51	51	53
Fair	48	43	39	30	27	16	8	10	9
Weak	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0
Very Weak	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	1	0	2	10	3	27	35	12	12
Composite Rating**	3.17	3.24	3.62	3.72	3.88	3.71	4.08	4.12	4.19

* *Very strong=5; strong=4; fair=3; weak=2; very weak=1.*
** *No response was eliminated from the calculation of the composite mean.*

The 1982, 1983, and 1984 composite means were not statistically different among themselves. All three, however, were significantly higher (.01) than 1981 and still higher (.001) over the first three years. The degree design is a complicated process but the students saw improvement across the years.

The program evaluation also measured perceived changes in Spanish fluency from the beginning. During the first six years, the students consistently rated their proficiency as higher at the end of their programs than at the beginning. The influx of students interested only in the ESL endorsement, in which Spanish was not a requirement, reduced the comparability during the last two years and they thus are not reported.

The number of undergraduates and the ESL teachers new to the program lowered the proportion of those who could judge the liaison services to the schools and teachers. Despite this difference, which because of limited numbers could easily have resulted in lowered appreciation of that service, the ratings remained remarkably stable across the years - between effective and very effective. (Table 6) That is, those who knew the program rated it quite high.

Few evaluator observations of the liaison visits were conducted during the monitoring due to the press of time. Interviews with the participants and with some of principals were utilized in this regard. Their comments ranged widely in content depending upon the nature of the assistance furnished, but their qualitative judgments were much like those they gave in the written ratings: it is a worthwhile project component. The liaisons were experienced professionals and the advice and help they gave the students was appreciated. Principals were even more positive.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of the Liaison Services: 1976-1984

Response Category*	1976 %	1977 %	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1984 %
Very effective	11	12	14	16	20	16	17	14	16
Fairly effective	13	13	13	27	27	4	10	8	10
Not effective	4	3	3	4	6	0	0	0	0
No response/Not observed	72	72	70	67	47	80	73	78	74
Composite Rating**	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4

* *Very effective=2; effective=1; not effective=0.*
** *Not effective was used in the calculation of the composite rating but the no responses were excluded.*

In earlier years, the evaluation included the consultant services portion of the project. The general reduction of funds caused to be considerably reduced but, as was noted in an earlier context, almost all the students rated them as very effective, regardless of how many there were.

During the first seven years, the project included funds for a news organ, called *Boletín,* that contained information on state certification requirements, reviews of state and federal legislation, articles by students and faculty, and course offerings at the different sites. It had wide distribution to schools, districts, and students; additionally, bulletin board copies were sent to the other universities. This latter was particularly important because students within the North Texas Federation could apply courses from one university to their programs in others. The eighth year funds did not provide for its production and distribution and that lack was sorely lamented by everyone concerned.

Two other service components were always rated very highly by the participants: the library holdings and the curricular materials held in a special collection. The comments noted the convenience of the service (professors carried materials to the classes away from the home campus in the early years but they were later made more available through the library at the Satellite Learning Center). Graduate students felt the services to be especially helpful since the library holdings facilitated their research and the teachers were able to make direct use of the curricular materials in improving their classroom teaching.

Although mostly covered in the section on institutionalization, the services to other organizations are mentioned again because of their importance. East Texas State University was especially active in aiding the Texas Education Agency, that entity's Regional Service Centers, and the Dallas Evaluation and Dissemination Center. While they were of little cost to the project, they amounted to substantial assistance in the development of the regularions, degree and endorsement programs and the training that was authorized. The materials produced are widely used throughout the area, and in so far as the project contributed to their development, stand as solid achievements of the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education project at East Texas State University.

Services, then, were a vital component of the project. Bilingual education, and later, English as a second language instruction, were new to the area. The strong contributions of the project, and the University itself, to the articulation of them represent worthy federal investment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Perceptions of the Instruction

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII project emphasized the improvement of the delivery of the instruction to the students. The provision of materials, professors experienced in bilingual education, and assistance on both of these so that the environment would maximize the intended effects. Greater learning by the students, who were or would become the teachers and specialists in the districts, would benefit the pupils in the bilingual classrooms.

University systems are such that a special project cannot demand changes in the way courses are taught; it can only offer assistance and suggestions so that those who want to improve can do so. Individual professors are jealous of their courses and sometimes resist modifications that might make their work more acceptable to students, reasoning that their subject matter is more important than what the students think. Too, circumstances do not always permit a University the ideal choice for an instructor in a particular course. East Texas State University continually worked toward the long range goal of improved teaching, both by offering assistance to and by choosing the best personnel it could find. Several of the professors always asked for the ratings on their courses, discussed the comments with the evaluator, and made sincere efforts toward improvement. They were, by and large, successful, and the ratings improved over time.

However, some subjects, in and of themselves, were less well received, and the ratings tended to remain low or toward the middle of the range. Some of these involved an unusual amount of outside work, some were more theoretical than practical, and in other cases, the students simply did not like or appreciate the courses. The perceptions also varied a great deal among the students, sometimes ranging from very low to very high, as would be expected among a large number of students; this was most often true for undergraduate courses than for graduate, and tended to be more frequent on basic rather than courses in the students' majors.

Nevertheless, the University insisted that student perceived information about the courses and the program as a whole be an input to the improvement of the project and its other services as well. The continuous experience of the evaluator with the program demonstrated improvement could be achieved.

General Program Opinions

Each student was asked to comment or make suggestions about how the program was conducted. Over the years, but in lesser quantities each year, they expected that the professors would use more Spanish in the classes. The amount of Spanish, of courses, was in part dictated by the proficiency of the professor and in part by that of the composition of the class. The suggestions did note differences but still indicated their own concerns for greater fluency in Spanish and the recognition that its utilization in the classes would help them improve. Two divergent evidences of this concern were frequent complaints that an undefgraduate Spanish course was conducted almost entirely in English, and the reverse, substantive compliments about a graduate Spanish course always taught almost exclusively in that language.

The second type of comment was that engendered by perceived improper conduct of a course. While these were infrequent, and often improvement was demonstrated later, these should be noted for other programs. Examples of these included:

- Students expected that Spanish would be the dominant language in a Spanish course, as previously noted; they objected strenuously when it was not.

- Both Mexican Americans and non-Mexican Americans objected to disparaging remarks about Mexican Americans and/or about their Spanish.
- A few non-major undergraduate courses were the subjects of almost continual criticism; the grading systems, lack of explanations, and "uncaring" professors encompassed most of these.
- Most of the graduate courses, especially those on Spanish, enjoyed very favorable comment throughout the eight years.
- Professional maturity was evidenced in comments about some graduate courses that emphasized the "civil rights" aspects in detriment to the practical content.
- Except on rare occasions, the main bilingual and ESL courses, whether graduate or undergraduate, were positively received.

It should be emphasized that the relative difficulty of a course was not a factor in the students' ratings. For example, the graduate Spanish course comments often combined the judgments of "hardest course I've had" and "best course of all." As will be seen in the next section, the traditionally difficult courses of mathematics and science were as apt to be rated highly as some seen as "easier."

Positive comments and worthy suggestions always far outnumbered those that were negative. Most students at least appended a note about their learning, the utility, and the conduct of the courses. Typical of the suggestions were:

> ...this course should be offered at the beginning of the Masters program...
>
> ...I learned more about writing and improving my presentations though this [illegible]rch course than in any other...
>
> ...is to be congratulated for the finest course ever presented in this or any other program in which I have been enrolled...offer another...
>
> ...now I want more; a followup course or courses on Spanish grammar and composition would greatly improve this program.
>
> ...this history course taught me more about myself and my people than I thought possible...please make a followup course available.
>
> ...at least I understand now what a research paper or article is saying and not saying... more..!
>
> ...focusing homework on the production of materials directly related to my teaching gave me much better insights into the subject than routine theory repititions would have.
>
> ...more sociology...it helps me understand the little things...

In general, then, both the program design and its conduct, as seen through the eyes of the participants, showed a steadily improving rating across the years. Many of their suggestions were put into practice. Several professors substantially improved their courses.

Course Ratings

The ratings on every course were submitted with the number of students rating it to the director every year, in confidence, to enable him to talk with professors or otherwise attempt improvements. The annual reports, however, were couched in general terms so that the professors could not be identified. As would be anticipated, a few students took a very wide variety of courses; these were often too few to make the ratings representative of the subject or its conduct. In order to

maximize the information, courses with three or more ratings in any quarter were grouped into general subject areas. These are presented in Table 7 for the eight years of the grant.

NOTE particularly that the intervals on the rating scale and the direction is different on the course ratings than in the previous tables. The direction was reversed so that *very strong=1, strong=2, fair=3, weak=4, very weak=5.* The lower the mean rating, the more positive it is.

Table 7: Comparative Overall Ratings by Students of the Courses Taken to Fulfill their Degree Requirements: 1976 through 1984 (mathematical means*)

Course Areas	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Language									
English, undergraduate	1.91	1.92	1.99	1.81	1.85	1.84	1.85	1.33	1.35
English, graduate	1.48	1.48	1.45	1.44	1.37	1.38	-	1.33	1.33
Spanish, undergraduate	3.87	3.88	3.87	2.92	2.76	2.86	3.33	2.06	2.81
Spanish, graduate	1.24	1.20	1.18	1.21	1.30	1.22	1.22	1.24	1.20
Linguistics	3.44	3.44	3.52	3.00	-	3.06	3.02	1.24	1.22
Education									
Elementary, undergraduate	2.36	2.39	3.00	2.32	2.51	2.44	2.50	1.97	1.88
Elementary, graduate	2.04	1.97	2.00	2.12	1.90	1.87	1.62	1.58	1.56
Secondary, undergraduate	1.97	1.90	-	-	1.80	1.67	1.68	1.50	1.49
Administration	-	-	1.54	1.50	1.51	1.50	1.50	1.38	1.30
Research	-	2.07	1.97	-	1.86	1.54	1.34	1.34	1.33
Social Sciences									
History	2.33	2.20	2.21	1.97	1.54	1.56	1.45	2.00	1.87
Political Science	2.67	2.68	2.54	2.60	2.80	2.37	2.50	2.50	2.51
Psychology	1.77	1.90	1.88	1.68	1.55	1.55	1.45	2.00	1.67
Sociology	1.45	1.50	1.51	1.67	1.35	2.20	2.25	3.00	2.80
Math/Science**									
Mathematics	1.60	1.63	1.63	1.70	1.60	1.81	1.80	2.00	1.63
Biology	1.61	1.62	1.80	1.40	1.44	1.50	1.50	1.75	1.58
Botany	-	-	2.45	2.50	-	2.45	2.83	-	-
Earth Sciences	-	-	1.13	1.24	-	1.26	1.00	1.00	1.16
Others									
Computer Science	-	-	-	1.24	1.32	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Physical Education	-	-	2.75	2.77	2.80	2.82	2.75	2.75	2.89

* *The students rated each course on six variables: content, methods, grading system, tests, learning, overall; the mean utilized in this table is a calculated mean from the six variables.*

** *These were all undergraduate courses except for a few reports on statistics and earth sciences.*

NOTE: Very strong=1, strong=2, fair=3, weak=4, very weak=5.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The University and the project's efforts to improve the instruction gave results. On some it took a considerable amount of time but others were modified quickly. The major information from Table 7 includes:

English: Both undergraduate and graduate courses started near the "strong" rating and moved close to the "very strong" by the end of the period.

Spanish: Undergraduate Spanish was a continuing problem, starting at a "weak" rating but improving to "fair" except one year in which it was at "strong." Graduate Spanish, on the other hand, began very near "very strong" and continued there throughout the eight years. Graduate Spanish consistently enjoyed the highest ratings of the specific project courses.

Linguistics began low and showed little improvement until the last two years; in those two, it was rated near "very strong."

History began below the "strong" category, showed some increased appreciation for four years, and declined slightly.

Political science stayed roughly the same, between "fair" and "strong."

Psychology did not vary much, hovering around the "strong" rating.

Sociology was the only grouping that deteriorated across time.

Mathematics and biology were quite consistently between "strong" and "very strong"; botany about a point below that; earth sciences were always the highest of the science courses.

Computer science started high and the last four years received a unanimous "very strong" indication.

Physical education remained toward the "fair" side every year.

Elementary education, for graduates and undergraduates, started about "strong" and improved through the years, with graduate courses showing the highest increase.

Secondary education was quite consistently toward "strong" the whole time.

Administration courses began and ended midway between "strong" and "very strong" and kept that appreciation.

Research in education (occasionally in another area) was initially at "strong" but in the last three years was nearer to "very strong."

Although the project began its ratings of the courses from the very beginning, the University did not press its student evaluations until 1982. Since most areas showed improvement from about that point on, it is probable that the combination of the evaluations worked together for still greater improvement than had already been begun.

It is clear, however, that project influence resulted in improvement, especially when the professors were concerned, asked for their ratings, and discussed them with the project director and the evaluator. In a few cases, remarkable improvement was made in a short time. Others required the eventual change of personnel to effect. One element that modified the ratings at times were the adjunct professors. Only one continued throughout the eight years and her ratings were consistently among the best in the study. Others were contracted for courses when the load was too great for the regular professors; while intensive reviews were conducted in their recruitment, some were much better than others. Project personnel served better the interests of good instruction, including the one long term adjunct, than did the casual employees.

A SEPARATE FOLLOWUP SURVEY

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program has carefully evaluated its important phases throughout its eight year life, obtaining the opinions and suggestions of students annually. These, in turn, have been computerized to allow for trends across the years. The mass of data, considerably attenuated during the past two years because of costs and utility for the present, have allowed many modifications in the operation of the program and, as seen in the earlier sections, a great deal of improvement. Indeed, the annual evaluations in recent years have shown the program to be strong in its component parts.

Not content with always viewing present-time data, the project decided to conduct a followup survey, apart from the regular annual evaluation, that would allow the past students, as well as those currently enrolled, to express their opinions and give suggestions for still further improvement. The suggestions of past students were accorded greater merit since they were no longer directly affiliated with the University and were employing what they had learned there, or feeling the lack of learning, in their positions.

Two approaches were taken to the survey. First, the program secretary undertook to contact all the previous students that had completed one or more semesters under funding from the ESEA Title VII project. The basic information on their present occupations, whether utilizing bilingual skills or not, and their current addresses. The second approach was that of mailing out a survey form to those for whom addresses could be verified; some, of course, had moved and left no forwarding address and could not otherwise be located. This was especially true for the first three years of the project; incomplete records also hampered the search for some former students.

The total possible former students was 163 for the period that could be verified. However, 24 of these could not be located, leaving 129 potential respondents. A summer mailing, necessary under the circumstances but always deficient for finding teachers, resulted in a return of 50 instruments; 48 more were returned in late fall 1984.

The instrument, presented in Appendix C, contained many similar elements to that used for the annual evaluations. To allow for separate calculations of the data, present from past enrollment was contained as an introductory item. Exactly half was enrolled at the time the survey was answered. Their present/past experience since enrollment, whether the experience involved bilingual or ESL, was requested. The possession of bachelor, masters, or doctorate degrees, whether they were obtained at East Texas State University or elsewhere, and a category for those that took only a few courses at the University checked that portion of the educational experience. Similarly, possession of the bilingual and other certificates and where they were obtained furnished valuable information.

An opinionnaire section followed, seeking the participants' judgments about the several subject areas in their studies at the University, as well as their endorsement/certificate and degree programs. Finally, they were asked to rate their East Texas State University program as a whole. Equally important with the ratings, the respondents were asked to add any comments about each opinion component, explaining their ratings or offering suggestions.

The forms were forwarded to the evaluator, who analyzed the answers and prepared

the present report. A provisional report was submitted on the survey in fall 1983; the present is an update of it on the 99 students (77% of the potential).

Characteristics of the Survey Participants

The direct contact survey by the program secretary produced both primary (discussions with the former student) and secondary (information from other sources) data on them. Slightly over 89% was employed in a bilingual setting, teaching or in some other way, serving the bilingual populations of their schools, districts, and universities. Some, of course, had been promoted to non-classroom positions but in any event, they were still concerned with children speaking languages other than English. The East Texas State University has, then, admirably served its principal purpose of adding to the resources available to limited and non-English speaking children.

The remaining 11% was in a variety of positions, mostly those of teaching in a regular, full English classroom. Only three persons were in non-education positions, all in business requiring no Spanish in their opinion.

The mail form respondents, as noted previously, contained some currently enrolled. Many of these, however, were also teaching or working in other positions at the same time. The declared occupations (Table 8), showed only 9% to be full time students. Six percent was in business in one form or another.

Table 8: Occupations of the Responding Survey Students

Occupation	Percent	Occupation	Percent
Elementary teacher	56	Instructional specialist	2
Secondary teacher	9	Education writer	2
Aide	2	Curriculum coordinator	3
Volunteer/substitute	3	Business	5
Adult/college	3	Bilingual secretary	1
Administrator	4	Student	9

* *One person did not respond to this question.*

Of those who were not teaching at the time of the survey, 14% had taught since completing their studies at the University. Totalling those now teaching with those that had in the past, at least some of that experience was bilingual, 74%, and/or ESL, 43%. The undergraduate students, some of whom had taught and some had not, complicated the separation of them from the results of this question.

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents had already achieved the bachelors degree; thirty-six percent had obtained it from East Texas State University. The large number of masters students, plus those from other Federation universities who came in for special courses or the certificate program, accounted for the others. This is emphasized in the percentage with masters degrees - 38% - three-fourths from this University. Only two doctoral students replied; one had received the degree from East Texas State University and the other elsewhere.

Some thirteen percent noted they had taken only a few courses at East Texas State University, mostly these were Federation students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A major goal of many students in the program is the acquisition of the bilingual endorsement to the elementary teaching certificate. Three avenues were open to them: 1. complete all the requirements at East Texas State University and be recommended by that institution; 2. apply directly to the Texas Education Agency, receive a deficiency plan if they lacked any of the requirements, complete those at a university, and then submit the transcripts to the Agency; 3. participate in a district preparation program and take courses at a university, and be recommended by the district when the requirements were met. Forty-four percent of the respondents had already achieved that goal; 40% had done so directly through the Title VII program, the others taking some courses at East Texas State University and submitting the transcripts to districts or directly to the Agency.

Students who planned their degree programs accordingly, or who had the necessary transfer courses, were able to obtain other certificates or endorsements as well. Those attained by the respondents included: elementary (7), kindergarten (4), supervisor (3), special education (2), mentally retarded (1), Spanish (2), and ESL (2). The latter will, of course, increase substantially during the next few years.

In general, then, the respondents represented the program participants for the years encompassed. Obviously, the responses from the earlier years were few; their changes of residence made contacting them more difficult. The combination of undergraduate and graduate students, the different degree and certificate programs, and the conditions of the bilingual education programs in the districts were reflected appropriately among the Title VII participants.

Course Grouping Judgments

As noted at the beginning of the survey section, it was expected that those who had completed their work at the University and while in the profession had some opportunities to judge the program components more objectively, might rate their courses and degree designs differently than those still in school. That was true, however, in only one case; the graduate students no longer in school judged the Spanish courses even higher than did those now enrolled. The mean ratings for all other program elements were not significantly different when separated by former and present students. *(See Special Note to Table 9.)*

Table 9: Mean Ratings of the Survey Respondents on the Program Course Groupings

Course Grouping	Mean	Course Grouping	Mean
Spanish*	4.41	ESL methods	4.04
English	3.77	Other language methods	3.73
Social studies	3.77	Social/multicultural methods	4.30
Mathematics/science	3.48	Methods for other subjects	3.98
Bilingual methods	4.11		

** The mean for former graduate students was 4.87; undergraduate students, whether present or past, was 3.98.*

SPECIAL NOTE: In the sections of the annual evaluation, the rating scale was in reverse polarity with 1=very strong and 5=very weak. In the survey, 5=very strong, 4=strong, 3=fair, 2=weak, 1=very weak. The change was intentionally made to avoid routine replies. No respondent confused the scales.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Spanish enjoyed the highest rating of any course grouping, one-third higher than *strong*. There were also more comments appended to this item than any other. The majority of these were summary statements about the excellence of the courses. All the other directly positive notations commended the graduate Spanish professor for her knowledge, methods, and ability to motivate the students. Two graduate students recommended more practice and instruction on writing Spanish and two requested more courses on the language. Five undergraduate students repeated the complaints that have been nearly constant through the years: Spanish courses taught in English and one professor that ridicules Mexican Americans' Spanish.

The social studies/multicultural methods courses received a rating almost as high as Spanish, 4.30, again a third above the *strong* rating. Few comments were registered: one commended a workshop on multicultural methods as the best ever taken; two suggested that more courses be taught on this subject and that how to teach awareness of multicultural strengths would help the teachers.

The bilingual methods courses also received a better than *strong* judgment, 4.11. Some general statements about the utility and relevancy of the courses were included and one praised the staff highly. The only complaint was that the respondent felt that more writing methods should have been included.

The ESL methods courses also merited a *strong* rating, 4.03, and the second largest number of comments within this group; all from graduate students. The necessity and relevance of the subject were observed by eight respondents. Four made general positive statements about the work. One noted that the opportunity to find out what other teachers were doing was of special practicality. Two felt that the professors needed more elementary classroom experience and another noted that the information was mostly for elementary teachers and dwelt little on the teaching of ESL in secondary schools.

All the other subject groupings were judged between *fair* and *strong*. While only a few *weak* and no *very weak* ratings were marked in this survey, almost all of the *weak* judgments were given to this group. That is, there was a wide variation in the ratings, not unexpected since many professors were involved across the years. Too, few comments were appended to the items covering these course groupings; these tended to be specific statements, mostly negative, about particular professors.

In any survey of this type, there is always the concern that those feeling more positive toward the program and courses would be more likely to complete the form and return it. A comparison of the course ratings with those of previous years suggests that this did not happen. Undergraduates judged the courses almost exactly as they had each of the past three years. Graduate student ratings tended to be more positive than previously but their time away from the University probably explains that differential. When enough comments were included, such as was the case for Spanish, English, bilingual and ESL methods, they supported the ratings given. No systematic biases could be ascertained from the examination of the survey with the annual ratings.

Program Judgments

Three general program ratings were sought in the survey, two specific to the project (endorsement/certificate and degree designs) and one probed the overall East Texas State University experience. Almost no comments were appended to the ratings of the endorsement/certificate programs but the general University experience item brought a host of comments, both specific to the University and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to the courses, professors, and other program components. A few commented on the degree design.

The endorsement/certificate programs received an almost exactly *strong* rating, 3.93, and there was little variation among the respondents; an almost equal number judged them *fair*, *strong*, and *very strong*. Since there were no comments, no analysis of the differences could be made.

The degree design was given a higher rating, 4.08, just above *strong*. The few comments indicated that the students involved in transfers to other universities had experienced some difficulty. One complained generally about the Federation regulations, another said that acceptable courses to other Federation universities should be more clearly marked (one course did not transfer). The favorable comments centered on the excellent advice that had been given.

The general East Texas State University experience judgment was *strong*, 4.11, indicating a considerable satisfaction. No difference was found between the ratings of former and present students. The positive comments praised the availability of professors for conferences, the quality of that advice, and that the University takes an interest in, cares about, students. Five also made specific reference to the bilingual program staff as very helpful to students. Two noted that they had attended other universities and that the East Texas State University experience was the most rewarding of any. Only two negative context comments were included: some professors are prejudiced against Mexican Americans, and that in some curriculum courses, there is too much busy work and not enough content. The preponderance of commendations for the University experience was a strong feature for the University and for the Title VII project.

The survey form was designed to be folded and mailed, free of charge, back to the program office. That procedure left one third of the back without items for the respondents. Nevertheless, 51 (52%) utilized the space to add other comments. Some of these were reiterations of what had been said about the courses or the program: high praise for the graduate Spanish course and professor, accessibility of the professors and program staff, and special commendations for some other professors. Seven comments assessed the use of Spanish in the methods courses as very important to becoming truly bilingual; one noted her acquisition of professional vocabulary from that component.

Five participants utilized the space to make suggestions about the survey instrument. Four noted that some of the course groupings encompassed many courses in many departments, taught by many professors, and that the variation among them made it difficult to arrive at a rating. Social studies was given as an example in which one participant stated he would have rated some specific courses *very weak* and others *very strong*, thus he had to settle on a *fair* rating, which thus masked the reality of the situation. No doubt others experienced the same difficulty even though they did not express it as directly.

Four former students utilized the space to compliment the Title VII Bilingual Studies program for conducting the survey. All four noted they had studied at other institutions and had never been asked to make judgments about them. They felt the survey was an indication of the project and University concern for its students. Each also expressed an interest in knowing about the results; since the surveys were anonymous, communicating directly with them is not possible. An announcement about where and when interested persons might view the results would be appropriate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT SUMMARY

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education project began in fall 1976 and continued through summer 1984, eight years of Federal and University funding and with some supplemental monies from the Texas Education Agency. The goal of the project was to improve the education of limited and non-English speaking students in the North Texas area schools. To reach that goal, the program specified objectives related to the training of new bilingual teachers (undergraduates), of teachers already in service (masters program), administrators and specialists (post masters and doctoral levels).

The project insisted that all trainees be fully qualified as regular teachers and administrators, thus taking the full range of subject matter, teaching/administrative methodologies, and that the bilingual and multicultural education be added as required for specific bilingual degrees and/or the bilingual endorsement to the Texas certificates. English as a second language was added first as a subject and later as a degree and certificate endorsement objective. Nearly 400 participants were in the program; some took only a course or two as needed in other North Texas Federation universities, some only completed their certificate requirements; 129 completed the degree programs.

Measured proficiency in both English and Spanish was required of all recommended certificate and degree participants. To aid in its accomplishment, the University offered undergraduate and graduate courses, provided a language laboratory, and conducted as many of the classes as possible within a bilingual environment. The program began in conjunction with the Dallas Independent School District and later extended the collaboration to many others. Courses were offered regularly on the home campus at Commerce and in the Satellite Learning Center in the Dallas Metropolitan Area, as well as some in other districts. The main professors were fully qualified for University status and were part of the system; additionally, they were bilingual, experienced in bilingual education, and had produced worthy materials and/or research in the field.

Most of the professors were placed into the regular tenure track or were already in it. Some adjunct professors were needed for peak load periods; only one adjunct professor worked continuously through the eight years. Institutionalization of the staff, then, was unusually high; further, the full integration of the degree and certificate programs was effected through the regular University and Texas Education Agency channels. Professionalization was also strong with the staff producing books, papers, and articles through the period. Cooperation with other universities and agencies was likewise sound, lending professional support in many ways, especially to the Texas Education Agency, the North Texas Federation of Universities, the Dallas Evaluation and Dissemination Center, and the Regional Service Centers. The staff was active in the Texas and National Bilingual Education Associations, as well as societies for foreign languages and their teaching. All of the professors received at least one promotion and most were named as graduate faculty; they served on a wide range of University committees and advisory groups.

All eight years were evaluated externally and internally. The processes were monitored, student progress charted, and participant perceptions of the program, the processes, and the courses were measured annually and compared longitudinally as the students proceeded through the program. Interim quarterly reports were tended, annual summaries submitted, and conferences with University administration, project administration, professors, and participants added the contextual dimensions. The present report includes the information on the eighth year, 1983-1984, and the summarization of the entire period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Further, the project conducted a followup survey of former participants, beginning in summer 1983 and terminating in late fall 1984. A brief presentation of the results is also included in this final report.

Across the eight years, the degree design was seen in a more and more positive view, beginning between what was termed "fair" and "strong" but by midway was a fully "strong" rating. Liaison services to students and their schools was seen as fairly effective to very effective. Consultant seminars and conferences were judged very helpful, even when the funding for them was lowered and few could be held.

As a whole, the program was rated between "strong" and "very strong," and improved markedly after the first few startup years. The courses were considered carefully by the participants and their ratings varied a great deal. Some undergraduate offerings, especially in Spanish, received low marks; interestingly, these were rarely the courses considered difficult - science, mathematics, Egnlish were as apt to receive high ratings as those from any other field. Undergraduate elementary education course generally enjoyed "strong" ratings and some improvement was seen across the eight years. Graduate courses were almost all viewed very favorably, usually between "strong" and very strong." Graduate Spanish courses and computer science courses were rated nearly or at the "very strong" level.

The followup survey resulted in 99 replies; difficulties with persons moving and leaving no forwarding address kept this number to about 77% of the potential. A study of the students participating in the program and responding to the survey showed near coincidence. More than half was elementary teachers; the others were scattered through secondary, adult, college, administration and auxilliary services, and business. Almost all of the graduates taught bilingual or ESL education during their studies or following them. Mexican Americans made up more than half the students; other Latin Americans and Anglos made up the majority of those remaining. Just over 50% of the participants already had teaching experience, most in regular and bilingual education. About 89% reported they had achieved the BA, MA, and/or PhD during or just after their participation. More than 93% obtained either the bilingual or the ESL certificate endorsements.

The past students that replied to the survey rated the degree design, the program as a whole, and many of the courses as "very strong," thus raising their estimation with the added experience after completing the program. They remained discerning, however, and showed less appreciation for some courses at the graduate level and more at the undergraduate level, especially undergraduate Spanish.

An important aspect of the annual evaluations and the followup survey was the willingness of the participants to offer positive comments and suggestions. Indeed, a general recommendation after one graduate Spanish composition course, was that more grammar and writing should be included; the program was modified to offer them.

In general review, then, and when compared to other Title VII training programs, East Texas State University was far more successful in institutionalizing the project into its regular system; heavy work loads did not keep the staff from producing studies and other publications, nor in participating fully in University and community activities. The program was seen by the students as worthwhile and they were, for the most part, successful in gaining their degrees, certificates, and abilities necessary to teach bilingually and in English as a second language. The federal ESEA Title VII funds were well spent on this project with East Texas State University.

APPENDICES

A: Annual Student Evaluation Form

B: Participant Followup Survey Questionnaire

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY BILINGUAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Instructional Evaluation

Undergraduate__, Masters__, Post Masters__, Doctoral__

1. Present Occupation:

__Teacher, grades 1-3 __Administrator __Other, please specify:

__Teacher, grades 4-6 __Aide _____

__Teacher, grades 7-12 __Student

2. Total Teaching Experience:

__None __3-5 years

__Less than 9 mo. __6-10 years

__1-2 years __11 or more

3. Total Bilingual eaching Experience:

__None __3-5 years

__Less than 9 mo. __6-10 years

__1-2 years __11 or more

4. Male__Female__

5. Ethnicity: Mexican American__, Black__, Anglo__, Other (specify):_____

6. Do you have the bilingual education endorsement? Yes__, No__

7. If yes, was the endorsement obtained through: ETSU__, district__, other university__

8. __ I am receiving Title VII funding for this program.

__ I am paying my own fees.

__ I am receiving other than Title VII funding.

WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVING THE FOLLOWING? (Use back if needed.)

1. Language program

2. Culture program

3. Teaching methodologies

4. Research

5. Looking at your degree program as a whole, and from what you can tell at this point, how would you rate it?

__very weak, __weak, __fair, __strong, __very strong

...continued...

6. How would you rate your fluency in Spanish at this point in the program?

__very fluent, __fairly fluent, __know some Spanish, __know nearly no Spanish

How would you rate your writing in Spanish?

__very fluent, __fairly fluent, __can write some, __can write very little.

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the liaison program (school visits) in helping you?

__very effective, __fairly effective, __not effective, __not observed

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER TO INDICATE YOUR RATING FOR EACH OF THE COMPONENTS OF EACH OF YOUR COURSES (please request a separate sheet for each):

	1 very strong	2 strong	3 fair	4 weak	5 very weak
1. How would you rate the coverage of the subject matter?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How would you rate the methods used in teaching the course?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How closely were the tests related to the materials covered?	1	2	3	4	5
4. In so far as you can tell at this point, how would you rate the grading system used in this course?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How would you rate your learning in this course?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Taking all factors into consideration, what would your rating be for this course?	1	2	3	4	5

Course/Dept._____Number_____Section____

Social Security Number (optional)_____

ETSU STUDENT SURVEY

The East Texas State University Bilingual Studies program is conducting this followup survey to obtain information about its academic program and how it can be improved. We would appreciate your replies to these few questions as a part of that effort. Please feel free to add any suggestions that will help the program.

Thank you. Dr. Alonzo Sosa, Coordinator A. H. Sosa

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1.a. I am currently taking one or more courses at ETSU. Yes __No__
b. I am currently taking one or more courses at another university. Yes__ No__

2.a. What is your current occupation? Teacher: Elementary__ Secondary__; Administrtor (specify): _____ Other (specify): _____
b. If you are not a teacher now, did you teach after leaving ETSU? Yes__No__
c. If you taught, did you teach in a bilingual program? Yes__No__
d. Did you teach ESL or a similar program? Yes__No__

3. Academic training achiever:

a. Bachelors degree: Yes__No__ (b) If yes, at ETSU:__or another university?___
c. Masters degree: Yes__No__; (d) If yes, at ETSU?__or another university?__
e. Doctoral degree: Yes__No__; (f) If yes, at ETSU?__or another university?__
g. I only took a few courses at ETSU rather than a degree or certificate program ✓

4. a. Do you hold the bilingual endorsement? Yes__No__;
b. Did you qualify for it at ETSU? ___or at another institution?___
c. If you obtained any other certificate or endorsement from ETSU, please list it (them): _____

EVALUATION INFORMATION:

Please answer the following questions by circling a number on the scale that best describes your judgement about the program components listed: 1-very weak, 2=weak, 3=fair, 4=strong, 5=very strong, 6=didnot participate/don't know/does not apply. Please use the comment line for exceptions or other special ideas you want to communicate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. a.Spanish course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
6. a. English course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
7. a. Social studies/history course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
8. a. Math/science course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
9. a. Bilingual methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
10. a. Other language arts methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
11. a. ESL methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____
12. a. Social studies/multicultural methods course(s) 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Comment _____

13.a. Course (s) on methods for other subjects 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

14.a. Your endorsement/certificate program as a whole 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

15.a. Your degree program as a whole 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

16.a. Thinking about your ETSU program as a whole, including advising, academics, and assistance, please give an overall rating. 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Comment_____

_____

_____

Please fold so that the portion above is inside - covered up. Thank you for your help.

Fold here, please, so that the portion below is outside; staple or tape the edge, and mail.

Prepaid Postage

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Office of Bilingual Studies
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas 75428